

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,323	05/16/2006	Hideo Satsu	5404/152	6569
757 BRINKS HOF	7590 01/08/2008 ER GILSON & LIONE		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 10395			MELLER, MICHAEL V	
CHICAGO, IL	, 60610		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u> </u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/579,323	SATSU ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
•		Michael V. Meller	1655			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE IN THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	· •					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 December 2007</u> .					
,	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
•	4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 and 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
·	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
•	Claim(s) <u>8</u> is/are rejected.		•			
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
•						
Attachmer	nt(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
3) 🔯 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number:

10/579,323 Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group IV, claim 8 in the reply filed on 12/4/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the inventions of Groups V and VI share common definitive technical features with the group IV invention. Applicant further submitted that each of the inventions can be stimulated and infectious diseases prevented, by promoting IL-8 production. This is not found persuasive because as already noted on the record, the claims do not find a special technical feature since claim 1 and claim 2 claim two materially distinct products which do not share a common technical feature, thus the application lacks unity. Further, treating infectious disease and stimulating immunity are very different in both mechanism and action from promoting interleukin production since promoting interleukin production reads on prevention as explained below and it is well known that preventing a disease and treating it are clearly different in mechanism and effect. Simply because immunity is stimulated will definitely not prevent it.

Therefore, claims 1-7 and 9-12 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Application/Control Number:

10/579,323 Art Unit: 1655

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is noted in applicant's specification on page 14 that the interleukin (IL) promoters of the invention prevent infectious disease in mammals. Thus, the term "promoting interleukin production in mammal " reads on prevention since applicant has defined the phrase to mean this and the phrase lacks written description since there is no way to totally and utterly prevent infectious diseases in each and every circumstance in a mammal. Unless applicant can show that they were in possession of a method

10/579,323

Art Unit: 1655

which would have prevented infectious disease in each and every mammal, the claim lacks written description.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is confusing since it is not clear what the compound represented by the formula is. It would be clearer if applicant inserted the formulas in the claim. This further would make the claim complete and much more concise. A claim must be complete on its own and one would need to refer to what the formula is and this should be in the claim to make it complete.

Further, it is noted that "mammal" by itself needs "a mammal" to make it grammatically complete within the context of the claim.

It is also noted that "a kind" is confusing". All of these "kinds" are extracts and should be claimed as such.

10/579,323 Art Unit: 1655

The term, "dokudami (houttuynia herb) " is confusing since dokudami is a specific type of houttuynia herb. Applicant is requested to specifically claim which houttuynia herb dokudami is as noted on page 7 of applicant's instant sepcification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelly et al. (US Patent 6,265,011).

Kelly teaches in the example that peppermint extract is in a dog biscuit that is administered to dogs. It is noted in applicant's specification on page 14 that the IL promoters of the invention prevent infectious disease in mammals thus any mammal can benefit from such a prevention including dogs.

10/579,323

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 571-272-0967. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael V. Meller Primary Examiner Art Unit 1655